

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION  
SPONSORED PROJECT INITIATION

Date: May 26, 1976

Project Title: Leadership Training Program in Community Economic Development

Project No: B-467

Project Director: Mr. R. B. Cassell

Sponsor: Georgia Community Continuing Education Service; Athens, Ga. 30602

Agreement Period: From April 1, 1976 Until March 31, 1977

Type Agreement: Letter dated 4/1/76 (Sponsor Proposal # 76-008-009)

Amount: \$14,175\* \*Includes \$9,450 Federal Funds and \$4,725 EES Matching Funds.

Reports Required: as necessary

Sponsor Contact Person (s):

Technical Matters

Mr. Bradley C. Courtenay  
Training Coordinator  
Georgia Community Continuing Education Service  
Center for Continuing Education  
University of Georgia  
Athens, Georgia 30602  
Phone: (404) 542-5382

Contractual Matters  
(thru OCA)

Defense Priority Rating: None

Assigned to: Economic Development (~~School~~/Laboratory)

COPIES TO:

Project Director  
Division Chief (EES)  
School/Laboratory Director  
Dean/Director-EES  
Accounting Office  
Procurement Office  
Security Coordinator (OCA)  
Reports Coordinator (OCA)

☒ Library, Technical Reports Section  
Office of Computing Services  
Director, Physical Plant  
EES Information Office  
Project File (OCA)  
Project Code (GTRI)  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION  
SPONSORED PROJECT TERMINATION

Date: May 16, 1977

Project Title: Leadership Training Program in Community Economic Development

Project No: B-467

Project Director: Mr. R. B. Cassell

Sponsor: Georgia Community Continuing Education Service; Athens, Ga. 30602

Effective Termination Date: March 31, 1977

Clearance of Accounting Charges: April 30, 1977

Grant/Contract Closeout Actions Remaining:

- ☒ Final Invoice ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
- ☐ Final Fiscal Report
- ☐ Final Report of Inventions
- ☐ Govt. Property Inventory & Related Certificate
- ☐ Classified Material Certificate
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Assigned to: Economic Development Laboratory (School/Laboratory)

COPIES TO:

Project Director  
Division Chief (EES)  
School/Laboratory Director  
Dean/Director-EES  
Accounting Office  
Procurement Office  
Security Coordinator (OCA)  
Reports Coordinator (OCA)

Library, Technical Reports Section ✓  
Office of Computing Services  
Director, Physical Plant  
EES Information Office  
Project File (OCA)  
Project Code (GTRI)  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

Final  
COMPLETION REPORT  
TITLE I (HEA) PROJECT ACTIVITY

1. Project Title: (76-008-009) ACTIVITY REPORT

Leadership Training Program In Community Economic Development

2. Location of Project:

Seven North Georgia communities: Calhoun, Canton, Greensboro-Union Point, Lavonia, Lula, Summerville, and Thomaston

3. Primary Institution of Higher Education:

Georgia Institute of Technology

4. Cooperating Institutions of Higher Education:

None

5. Project Director (Name, Title and Address)

Robert B. Cassell  
Principal Research Scientist  
Industrial Development Division  
Technology and Development Laboratory  
Engineering Experiment Station  
Georgia Institute of Technology

6. Identify the Community Problem

I. Categorize the project in terms of problem area. (Check one)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government            | <input type="checkbox"/> Crime/Law Enforcement           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing               | <input type="checkbox"/> Health                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Poverty               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation        | <input type="checkbox"/> Human Relations                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Personal Development            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Youth Opportunities   | <input type="checkbox"/> Education/School Systems        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation            | <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employment            | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use                        |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                           |



- II. Describe the community problem. The description need not be lengthy but should be specific and clearly stated.

Community leaders in most small towns need considerable indoctrination and training in the actual process of dealing with potential investors and similar entrepreneurs who may consider those communities as locations for the establishment of some sort of new industrial activity. Economic development, being the central thrust on the part of such communities, has become much more sophisticated; therefore, the leadership, unable to rely on internal professional assistance, must respond to the situations more effectively.

7. Describe the Specific Objectives of the Project:

The relationship of the objectives to the problem must be shown and the achievement of these objectives must be measurable.

The immediate objective was to make local community leadership aware of the underlying principles involved in selection of new industrial plant locations. A subset of this objective includes: the formalization of the constituency of local economic growth and development; an impartial analysis of the assets and liabilities of the community; the construction of positive programs to utilize the community resources; and the application of sound business principals and techniques in the attraction of additional investment.

8. Project Operations

- I. What was the primary type of activity? (Check one)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mass Media                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conference                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Radio                                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Workshop/Seminar | <input type="checkbox"/> Television                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Research                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Assistance        | <input type="checkbox"/> Information Dissemination               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Counseling (Personal)       | <input type="checkbox"/> (i.e. publications, pamphlets, manuals) |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)                         |

- II. Describe the project content, method, and materials employed, the personnel involved, and where applicable, the frequency of duration of sessions.

See Attachment I.



Attachment I.

In each of the seven communities, the following steps were executed. Each community was selected after a series of consultations between the Georgia Tech representatives, Area Planning & Development Commission participants and the Georgia Department of Industry & Trade (see list below). At the introductory session with community representatives (about an hour and a half), the program was explained, the type of community leaders who ought to be involved were described, and the schedule of events outlined. A number of questions were raised at each meeting.

A copy of Bringing in the Sheaves by John R. Fernstrom was handed to each community group with suggestions as to sections applicable in the training program. In about half of the cases, the book was followed as a text by the group in the training session.

The subsequent meeting was one at which a consultant outlined the investigating industry's needs and requirements. This session of between two and three hours consisted of questions and answers, explanations of data prepared, and requests for additional information. All of these factors and documentation were evaluated by the Georgia Tech team.

At the following session, duration of one to one and a half hours, a written critique was presented and reviewed. In every case, a general discussion of the principles enunciated and specific suggestions for a program of improvement were made.

At a final community seminar, lasting about two hours, the general background of the specific training program was outlined, information presented on the condition of Georgia's economic status and its future and the results of the community program were reviewed. A press release for this event was prepared for local newspaper use (see Appendix II). Included in this session was an audio-visual presentation prepared by the AIDC Educational Foundation on the Community Contact Team. The session was concluded with a general question and answer segment dealing with the specific recommendations made by the Georgia Tech professional team.

Personnel involved at one or more sessions:

From Industrial Development Division, Engineering Experiment Station,  
Georgia Tech --

Robert B. Cassell  
Winfred G. Dodson  
Eric Berg  
William C. Darley, Jr.  
Kay Powell  
William Craig

From the Area Planning and Development Commissions:

Ken Kessler, North Georgia, Dalton  
Emory Brock, Coosa Valley, Rome  
Edward Houghtaling, McIntosh Trail, Griffin  
Russ Ernst, McIntosh Trail, Griffin  
Larry Glasgo, Georgia Mountians, Gainesville  
Don Nicholson, Georgia Mountains, Gainesville  
James Corrigan, Northeast Georgia, Athens

From the Georgia Department of Industry and Trade:

John R. Gilliland

9. Project Accomplishments

A. Evaluation

- I. Discuss the nature and the findings of the project evaluation. Include an assessment of the project's success in meeting its specific objectives (see #7). In addition, comment on what you see as the reasons for the success or failure of the project. Did the project reach the anticipated target group? Was the level of participation as high as was projected? What outcome is most worthy of dissemination to other states and institutions of higher education?

See attachment II

- II. Will the program itself continue beyond this period of Title I funding? If so, under what sponsorship or support? (Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/> Continued under Title I	<input type="checkbox"/> Accomplished purpose, no further plans
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continued with other Federal funding	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsuccessful, no further funding
<input type="checkbox"/> Continued with non-Federal funds	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)

## Attachment II.

In most cases, the project appeared to be successful in enabling local leadership to meet the major objectives. Each community now has a more knowledgeable contact team, one backed with documented data. Also, in most communities there now exists a better understanding of the function of community economic development and the requirement for an informed cadre of dedicated and hardworking citizens.

While the project did reach, in most cases, the target group, the level of participation was not as high as projected. This may be in part because of the "over-seminaring" of Georgia community leadership. Also, in a few instances, the local contact really was unable to identify or to motivate the community leadership. The leading example of this situation was encountered in Greensboro where the young "arriving" leadership has not made contact with nor succeeded in winning the confidence of the old establishment.

The outcome of this project most susceptible to dissemination or transfer to other states (aside from information in 9A above) and institutions of higher learning is the systematizing of the procedure for communicating with outside investors. Those procedures are covered in a sample report appended as Appendix I.



## B. Relative to Institution(s) of Higher Education

Indicate the impact of the project upon on-going program(s) of participating colleges and universities. Have changes occurred, or are they anticipated, in the organization, curriculum, budget, community service program, or other aspects of the institution(s)? Describe any planned or unexpected "spin-offs" involving additional funds or activities generated:

Very little impact from this project has been witnessed in the present on-going program of this institution. Due to a major reorganization within the Engineering Experiment Station structure, it may be that the immediate impact will be dissipated.

The major spin-off derived has been that a Federal agency has picked up the program and arranged for its expansion, embellishment, and execution in several other states.

## C. Relative to the Community

Specify the extent and the nature of the involvement in the project of community leaders, citizens, public and private agencies, and state and local government. Were they, for example, involved in the initiation of the proposal and/or the planning and development of the project? Have any new community agencies, organizations or groups been established as a result of this project? Has the community service capability of existing agencies and organizations been increased? If so, please describe:

Designated community leaders were involved in the development of this project in every community. The actual process (with some minor changes) was applied in each case:

Contact was made with the respective area planning and development commission and the program was outlined. Along with the Industry and Trade representative, we and the commission representative talked with a small group of local leaders, reviewing the proposed steps and timing for each. Then the local group was relied upon to provide some guidance in the advancement of the program.

No new community agency or organization has been established as a result of the project.

The community service capability of existing agencies and organizations has been notably increased by making the contact teams much more alert to opportunities and more proficient in responding to inquiries. If the agency, on the basis of instruction and advice extended under this program, follows the principles enunciated, greater success can be anticipated.

## 10. Geographic area served by the Project (Check one)

☐ Urban                      ☐ Metropolitan                      ☐ Suburban  
☒ Rural                      ☐ Statewide                      ☐ Other (specify)

## 11. Prior History of the Project (Check one)

☐ New Report                      ☒ Expansion or improvement  
☐ Continuation of CSCE Project                      of a non-CSCE project  
☐ Revision of CSCE Project                      ☐ Other (specify)

12. Faculty Involvement (List the faculty members involved in the project, the nature of their activity, their academic discipline, and the percentage of their time spent on the project.)

<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Discipline</u>	<u>% of Time</u>
Robert B. Cassell	Project Director	Economic	10
Winfred G. Dodson	Instructor	Urban Planning	5
Eric Berg	Instructor	Economic Geography	5

13. Student Involvement (If applicable, indicate the nature of student involvement in the project as well as the number of students engaged in each activity.)

- A. Instructors                      D. Researchers/Data Collectors  
 B. Interns                      E. Other (specify in each instance)  
 C. Consultants (Tech. Assistance)

<u>Activity</u>	<u>No. of Students</u>
Not Applicable	

#### 14. Demographic Data

Demographic data on all actual participants should be collected and reported for each project. The data should be summarized in terms of sex, age, education and occupation. In addition, a brief narrative of the general characteristics of the participants should be included (i.e. were they city councilmen, upper level managers, housewives, etc? Were they the group for whom the project was intended?)

##### I. Demographic Summary:

	Males	102	Females	14
<u>A. Age</u>				
Under 21:		0		0
21-35:		25		5
36-55:		48		7
Over 55:		29		2
<u>B. Educational Level</u>				
Elementary:		0		0
Junior High School:		7		0
High School:		33		3
College below baccalaureate:		12		5
Baccalaureate:		35		4
Graduate or Professional:		15		2
<u>C. Occupational Classification</u>				
Professional:		14		02
Semi-Professional:		27		02
Skilled:		25		2
Semi-Skilled:		18		01
Unskilled:		0		01
Other (specify): Retired or Homemaker		18		6
<u>D. Number of Participants by Target Group</u>				
City elected officials:			10	
County elected officials:			9	
Area Planning and Development				
Commission staff:			6	
Civic group leaders:			25	
Local planning commission members:			4	
Practitioners in the field of aging:			-	
State agency, human services personnel:			-	
Small business owners, managers, employees:			19	
Paraprofessional health personnel:			-	
Volunteers:			25	
State and government financial management personnel:			-	
Other (specify): Unknown			2818	

##### II. Narrative Description:



15. Major Evaluation Procedure:

- ☒ a. Participant reactions
- ☐ b. Administration of pre and post tests to participants
- ☒ c. Staff appraisal of changed group practices
- ☐ d. Other (specify)

16. Project Materials [Describe the materials produced for and by the project (i.e. curriculum materials, films, etc.) and indicate whether copies are available for dissemination.]

Under the extremely limited funds, no curriculum materials were prepared; rather materials and publications currently available were employed. However, a critique for the performance of each team was prepared and this was given distribution within the community.

## 17. Express your judgment on the relationship of this project to the overall State program of Community Service and Continuing Education. (Title I, HEA)

I am convinced that the program is a sound one, and ought to be supported on a continuing basis, perhaps by the Georgia Departments of Industry & Trade and Community Development. The difficulty rests in convincing these agencies that such training programs and community leadership direction should have a higher priority than some of their on-going programs.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT  
FOR SUMMERVILLE, GEORGIA

Conducted by

Economic Development Laboratory  
ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION  
Georgia Institute of Technology

This Project Is Partially Financed By  
Program IMPACT of the Higher Education Act of 1965,  
Title I, Community Service and Continuing Education,  
U. S. Office of Education

(In cooperation with Georgia Department of Industry & Trade)

Purpose

*The intent of this program is to  
provide training for contacting  
and handling of industrial and  
other entrepreneurial prospects  
by Summerville community leaders.*

February 1977

## ACCEPTED PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING INDUSTRIAL PROSPECTS

- Step 1. Develop a working organization.
- Step 2. Determine if your town is ready for industry. Make a complete inventory including all the facts on:
- o Available labor supply.
  - o Transportation services, including air, rail, motor and water.
  - o Available plant sites.
  - o Available industrial buildings.
  - o Raw materials in quantity, including mineral, timber and agricultural products.
  - o Availability and cost of fuels and power.
  - o Local tax structure, past and present financial picture.
  - o Form of government and size of the town.
  - o Housing, schools, churches and recreational and cultural facilities.
  - o Extent of local financial assistance in the erection of plants and/or housing.
- Step 3. Develop a community Economic Brochure.
- Step 4. Get your town behind the drive for industry.
- Step 5. Decide on financial assistance for industry.
- Step 6. Handle your prospect's inquiry properly.
- o Govern your reply by the nature of the inquiry. Give the prospect the information he asks for, and offer more.
  - o Don't overload your reply with a lot of other material. Be factual, brief, honest.
  - o If the inquiry is general in nature, write back and ask for information on specific needs such as size of building, type of site, labor requirements.
  - o If you don't have the specific information requested by the prospect, get it. Call on specialists for help. But don't wait to reply: write, thank the prospect, tell him when he can expect the requested information.
  - o Get the information requested as soon as possible. When you forward it, refer back to your previous correspondence, and offer to develop further information if needed.



- o After your first letter, wait a week or ten days, then follow up with another letter, refer to your previous letter, enclose more related information, and offer further material on your town.
- o An alternate follow-up is a telephone call to the prospect, making the same offer. Use this method only if the inquiry appears definitely promising and you have something worthwhile to discuss. Don't waste the prospect's time.
- o If you get no reply to your second letter, wait a couple of weeks and try again. If you then fail to obtain a reply, you can decide the prospect is not interested.
- o In follow-ups of this type, try to get variety into your letters.

Step 7. Handle your prospect's visit properly.

- o Find out in advance as much as possible about your prospect's requirements.
- o Keep the visit confidential.
- o Have a small group meet with your prospect, confining the group to people who have the facts and can speak for your town.
- o Have specific information ready; be prepared to show specific sites and/or buildings.
- o Bring in a state-level specialist (bank, railroad, utility, state organization).
- o Keep your meeting businesslike. Never try to cover up any shortcomings you may have, but show how other assets offset them. No location is ideal in every respect.
- o Don't over-feed or over-entertain your prospect. He is in your town on serious business. His time is valuable -- don't waste it.
- o Be prepared to negotiate with your prospect, but know how far you can go on financing, provision of utility services, and related matters.

## COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO INITIAL INQUIRY

### Nature of Inquiry

The initial letter of inquiry provided the following details:

Metal manufacturing company -- consultant making survey.

Plant site of 25 to 30 acres, ready for construction, with adequate utilities.

Initial employment: 125 people (needed -- machine operators, welders, polishers/buffers; also large number of unskilled).

Eventual employment:

Most important criteria:

union situation

community attitude

attitude of existing industry

rail and truck transportation

electric power and natural gas

### COMMUNITY RESPONSE

- o The community sales team did respond to the initial letter of inquiry. However, that response did not interpret or relate data to specific requirements.
- o Missed the fact that plant building size had not been specified.
- o No phone number given on transmittal letter.

## COMMUNITY HANDLING OF PROSPECT'S VISIT

### Strong Points

Although the community leadership needs considerable additional experience and practice, many good points were observed:

#### INTRODUCTION

- o The group made the visitors feel welcome. They appeared sincere and "sold" on the need to attract more industry.
- o Name tags for local team were available.
- o Portion of county map was exhibited -- need to be more precise.
- o Agenda outline was excellent.

#### INFORMATION FURNISHED

- o Group interpreted some of the data supplied.
- o Had tour map.

#### LABOR

- o Seemed familiar with sources of information and technical training.
- o Used Gilliland as one source of data.
- o Cited existing industry to support labor availability.

#### TRANSPORTATION

- o The transportation situation was well covered.



## Community Handling of Prospect's Visit

### Strong Points (continued)

#### SITE

- o Prospect driven to industrial site and furnished considerable information.
- o Aerial photo of area furnished and oriented to site.
- o Group had costs of land and improvements.
- o County commitment for support.

#### PROPER QUESTIONS ASKED

- o Time frame for the project.
- o Need for financing, and company attitude on local assistance.
- o Company attitude toward financial assistance.
- o Type of building required and ceiling heights; need for sprinkler.
- o Company position on unions.

#### UTILITIES

- o Group was prepared with information and commitments on utility extensions.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

- o The community attitude towards new industry appeared positive.
- o Mentioned local contractor capabilities; and used new building to prove point.
- o Recreation, education, health facilities were covered.

## Community Handling of Prospect's Visit

### Weak Points

A considerable number of weak points appeared in community presentation:

#### INTRODUCTION

- o The introduction of the community team was good, but a list of these persons should be provided the prospect.
- o The initial orientation could be improved with use of a map of both Summerville and the region. This gives the prospect a better feel of the location, especially in regard to the highway network, physical location, other major towns, etc., answering many of his questions.
- o Inquiry as to time limitations was too general.
- o Data given to prospect was not verbally interpreted.

#### COMMUNITY TOUR

- o Community tour was incomplete. Several important points were omitted or ignored.
- o Tour ought to be expanded, although it was limited by time (see above).
- o The community tour could have been organized through the use of a film slide show.

#### INFORMATION FURNISHED

- o Maps and facts which adequately cover industrial site and community information should have been made available prior to visit, so the prospect could look them over.
- o Should have time for interpretation of all above data after given to prospect.

## Community Handling of Prospect's Visit

### Weak Points (continued)

#### LABOR

- o Labor availability and rates were not well covered -- seemed vague and needing interpretation.
- o Convincing data that this plant could be staffed was not presented.
- o Need to be more familiar with Vo-Tech and Quick-Start training.

#### EXISTING INDUSTRY

- o Should permit the prospect to have private personal interview with local industry without presence of community representatives (indicated this was planned).

#### TRANSPORTATION

- o Did not fully cover access to commercial airports.

#### UTILITIES

- o Failed to find out what sewage effluent might be, or reason for sewer make-up.

#### PLANT SITE

- o Rail spur availability was not firmed up.
- o Zoning of plant site should be considered.
- o Improved road access could be demonstrated more positively.

## Community Handling of Prospect's Visit

### Weak Points (continued)

#### BUILDINGS

- o More specifics on financing and construction should have been volunteered.
- o Construction costs could be critical to this company -- more positive data could be furnished.

#### INDUSTRY ATTITUDE

- o When prospect probed, local opinion was given.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

- o Community Economic Profile transmitted, but not really used for prospect's benefit.
- o Better initial meeting place should be used.
- o Did not cover certain amenities: housing, churches.
- o Get more details on where various plant services can be found.
- o When other towns are cited, their location or distance should be given.
- o Lack of knowledge of freeport law provisions.

#### SUMMARY

- o Did not ask about timing of company decision.
- o No one asked whether any subjects or questions had not been covered.
- o Did any one keep a list of unanswered questions, so that the prospect could be furnished answer later?
- o No one asked what, in effect, it would take to make Summerville the company's choice.

## COMMENTS FROM THE CONSULTANT

Your wide experience confirms that minute attention to the essential details before and during the prospect's visit can pay rich dividends in new jobs and capital investments for the local economy. Answers to all the technical, governmental and civic questions can be found through the talents and abilities that are readily available locally, regionally or statewide.

Failure to maintain these contacts, and apply these assets with imagination and diligence usually means the difference between winning and losing valuable new payrolls and tax revenues for a community.

For our smaller Georgia communities, the search is often difficult in finding the better elements which can be merchandized and refined to catch the attention of American industry, or others with substantial money to invest.

More particularly, the usually unrewarding search is almost imperceptibly directed toward singling out community leaders who can give the local effort some planned direction, constructive enthusiasm, and effective implementation. With few exceptions, small town leadership seems a quality which comes about as a matter of instinct.

As for Summerville, introductions were cordial and nameplates helped in identification of local group. Presentation of the written, suggested itinerary was somewhat of a surprise. Conscientious notetaking by the local group was evident. Intelligent questions relating to the building and site were raised. Except for a few knowledge gaps, the chairman kept the discussion on track and in the time frames. The local group was commended for furnishing helpful economic data to Georgia Tech for the prospect's use prior to the community visit. Brief session at the bank board room after the tour and before adjournment ended the meeting on a positive note.

The choice of meeting place was not the best one, considering the quality and convenience of the bank board room used after the tour. There was no identification of the business and/or governmental affiliation of the local delegation present or absent. Somewhat surprising was the complete lack of awareness of Georgia's Quickstart Vo-Tech Program, or the current effort to effect a Freeport Law in next month's election. The large scale aerial map of



Comments from the Consultant (continued)

the main site(s) on the bank board room table should have been displayed at the general meeting (and used to good advantage during the tour).

Considering the fact that two locally-based contractors were prominently mentioned in relation to local and comparative building costs, it would have been a simple matter to have one of them meet with us during the wrapup session at the bank. The chairman at the middle of the tour mentioned driving through some residential areas -- but failed to do so, and didn't explain why. Instead of the rather aimless cruise by the big carpet plant and back to town, he might have made some points by showing some executive-level homes to help the prospect envision the sort of residential atmosphere his branch plant manager might enjoy.

## COMMUNITY FOLLOW-UP

If Summerville is genuinely interested in obtaining the industry which this prospect represents, then it is desirable that the consultant making the investigation be furnished all of the information which he requested as soon as possible prior to the prospect's visit.

Then, other specific details should be compiled as developed from the prospect's visit and conference. That information should be accompanied by a letter setting forth the community's interest and an offer of further material and other specifics on the town.

Do not assume that when the prospect leaves that he is satisfied, and has all the facts he may need. Find out if that is the case, by asking.

As far as is known, only a limited effort was made by the Summerville group to follow-up on this project. The prospect could likely assume that Summerville is really not interested in obtaining this plant.

An immediate follow-up is also highly desirable, since both state and area development agencies deal with many communities and many prospects. They should be kept current on local progress, particularly in any further contacts with the prospect.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION

Summerville has already demonstrated that it can attract new industry (though this point was not as positively developed in the meeting with the prospect as it should have been). We are convinced that Summerville could improve its attractiveness to new industry if the following steps are taken:

- o Create a "Briefing Book" which could be used by the team (no matter what the number of individuals) in dealing with prospects, incorporating some of the items listed in the Economic Profile, and adding numerous others.
- o Create specific task forces on subject areas (i.e., utilities, labor supply, taxes, sites, financing, community attitude).
- o Develop a detailed Game Plan for handling industrial prospects. This plan should incorporate all matters pertaining to: (1) introductions, (2) local orientation, (3) community tour, (4) determining the precise needs of the prospect, and (5) furnishing the prospect with other needed information after his departure.
- o Emphasize more the team's business-like approach.
- o Become more conversant with data relating to building costs, labor availability and rates, truck transportation, pollution abatement, fire protection/rating.
- o Prepare a color slide presentation for use as either a substitute, or a back-up, for the community tour.
- o Prepare regional orientation map; improve community tour map with couple of touches.
- o Make better and more extensive use of other development agencies which can provide technical assistance.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

An informational seminar on Economic Development will be presented on next week for Thomaston and Upson County by the Economic Development Laboratory of Georgia Tech.

The Georgia Tech group has been working with the Thomaston-Upson County Industrial Authority and the Thomaston-Upson County Chamber of Commerce in a practical program which was undertaken over several months designed to assist in the attraction of new industry. The results of that program will be described and reviewed at the session, and suggestions made for improvement of the local efforts.

The program will contain specific suggestions on the technique of attracting new payrolls. The experience of other towns will also be explained.

Appearing on the program will be several specialists from Georgia Tech, including Robert B. Cassell who is director of the project, and John Gilliland, representing the Georgia Department of Industry and Trade from Atlanta.

The session, to be held at 7:30 at the civi center will be open to the public.

MARCH 18, 1977